

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 and 25-30 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 12, 18 and 26 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 12, 18 and 26 are sought to be amended. Claims 23 and 24 remain canceled. Entry and consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested. No new matter is believed to have been introduced by this Amendment.

Applicant has made the above Amendment to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Based on the above Amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding objections and rejections.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,484,207 (hereinafter referred to as "Petersen") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,338,084 (hereinafter referred to as "Rankin"). Applicant assumes that dependent claims 4, 5, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Petersen in view of Rankin. Applicant assumes that dependent claims 3, 6, 13 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Petersen in view of Rankin and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,026,433 (hereinafter referred to as "D'Arlach"). Applicant assumes that dependent claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Petersen in view of Rankin and

U.S. Patent No. 6,172,542 (hereinafter referred to as “Williams”) (used as evidence for Official Notice). Applicant assumes that claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Petersen in view of Rankin and U.S. Patent No. 5,345,327 (hereinafter referred to as “Savicki”) (used as evidence for Official Notice). Claims 18, 19, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. D’Arlach in view of Petersen and Rankin. Applicant assumes that dependent claims 20-22, 25 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over D’Arlach in view of Petersen and Rankin. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection since Petersen, Rankin, Williams, Savicki and D’Arlach, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each element of independent claims 1, 12, 18 and 26 for at least the following reason.

In one embodiment of the invention of the instant application, a switch-box is used to provide a convenient way to cut/copy information from a first computer system and to then paste that information to a second computer system (see, e.g., specification, page 5, lns. 27-29). However, confusion may arise, for example, when a user of the first computer system issues a standard cut/copy command and the information is copied to both a memory buffer in the switch-box and to a standard cut-and-paste buffer in the first computer system (see, e.g., specification, page 6, lns. 20-30). The present claimed invention avoids this potential confusion via the use of a first dedicated predetermined event. Independent claims 1, 12, 18 and 26 include a similar feature of the execution of the first dedicated predetermined event causes the information to be copied to the memory buffer (or external buffer or network cut-and-paste data-structure) in the switch-box and not to the standard cut-and-copy buffer of the

first computing system. Applicant respectfully asserts that Petersen, Rankin, Williams, Savicki and D'Arlach, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest this feature. For at least this reason, independent claims 1, 12, 18 and 26 (and their dependent claims 2-11, 13-17, 19-22, 25 and 27-30) are patentable over Petersen, Rankin, Williams, Savicki and D'Arlach, taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

INVITATION FOR A TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned, Molly A. McCall, at (703) 633-3311 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action. Thus, Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objections and rejections, and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,
Intel Corporation

Dated: September 9, 2005

/Molly A. McCall/Reg. No. 46,126

Molly A. McCall
(703) 633-3311

P10854 RCE Reply to non-final OA

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1000, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

September 9, 2005
Date of Deposit

Katherine Jennings
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

Katherine Jennings 9-9-05
Signature Date